

Sandralyn Bailey

04-207

From: james Blankenship [lindacblankenship@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2006 10:25 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Cable and satellite monopoly

Dear Chairman Martin:

DirectTV has a monopoly in our area, and the fees go up and up and we get less and less of what we want in a satellite service. When we first bought cable 25 years ago in California there were no commercials, zero. Look what we have now - commercials in every program, except the classic movie channel; paid programming (all day commercials), and multiple shopping channels. And we are forced to pay for garbage coming into our homes that we don't want because it's part of their "package". I'm 57 years old. I don't want MTV or the other music video channels, or Howard Stern. I go to the mall when I want to shop; so I don't need shopping channels. I'm tired of paying for junk I don't want. We should be able to pay for only the channels we want. Thank You.

Linda Blankenship
Barnhart, Missouri

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Sandralyn Bailey

04-207

From: Thomas L. Galusha [tgalusha2@rochester.rr.com]

Sent: Monday, February 13, 2006 8:36 PM

To: KJMWEB

Subject: 'a la carte' cable

YES, YES, YES.....Please!

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

2/14/2006

Sandralyn Bailey

04-2017

From: Lessard's [don086@centurytel.net]
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2006 3:19 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: A La Carte Television Pricing

Dear Mr. Martin, We believe it is time for consumers to be able to pick the channels of THEIR choice!! We support your reporting this issue to Congress, pertaining to subscribers of pay-television. We know that you have the support of Consumers Union, the Consumer Federation of America, cable operator Cablevision Systems, and AT&T, hopefully the FCC will consider users to pick their channels!!

Thank you, Mr. & Mrs. Donald Lessard, 9247N County Rd. CC, Hayward, WI 54843

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

2/14/2006

Sandralyn Bailey

04-2007

From: James T. Meixell [tjmeixx@rcn.com]
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2006 10:41 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

James T. Meixell (tjmeixx@rcn.com) writes:

Dear Sir,

I am a subscriber to RCN cable (located in Northampton, Pa.), and have been for about 40 years.

For the past 20 years, I have intensely resented the fact that, although I certainly have to pay a healthy amount of money for the services I receive, I, essentially, have no power to choose the channels I receive.

A few months ago, I went through the channels I get (basic package, no "premium" channels), one by one. Taking into account that three channels are received at two dial locations each, I discovered that I get 72 channels.

Great, you say?

Baloney!

Of those 72 channels, I counted 21 (count 'em, 21!!) channels that my wife and I NEVER, EVER watch -- 21 channels that we simply DO NOT WANT.

In addition, I found another 15 that we may watch once every month or so (such as the cartoon channels when our grandchildren visit for a weekend).

I'll do the math for you, although I'll assume you could do it yourself: That means that of the 72 channels I get (AND PAY FOR), fully 50 percent of them represent money throw down the garbage disposal.

Then there's the flip side: there are exactly four other channels that I would like to get, but don't. Three of them (Golf, Geography are two) I can only get by ponying up more cash. The fourth, one carrying horse race simulcasting, I can't get even if I WAS willing to pay extra -- although my son, who lives about 30 miles away and has a different cable company, gets it -- AS PART OF HIS BASIC PACKAGE!!

As a consumer, I believe ala carte packaging should be available. In fact, as far as I'm concerned, that's the only ethical policy. Not having the right to choose (and pay for) only those channels I want, is a flat out ripoff, a scam.

Now, RCN points out that they would love to offer ala carte -- but that the contracts it is forced to sign with the individual programmers make it impossible because they're forced to take the programmers' unpopular channels along with the popular ones and present them to subscribers in contracted service tiers.

Thus, I, as a consumer, am FORCED to subsidize unwanted channels.

You guys at the FCC, as I'm led to believe, exist to protect the consumer. In at least two areas, you are failing miserably in that regard.

The second, censorship of popular but risque programs that many of us adults want you to leave alone, I'll just mention in passing...that's another gripe for another day.

But by not enforcing a dramatically different policy regarding ala carte programming, you are simply giving us, the paying public, the upraised middle finger.

Quite simply, you should prohibit programming providers from coercing cable outlets into contracts that force them to carry the garbage channels nobody wants -- and then shove them down our throats.

Get with the program!

James T. Meixell
Bethlehem, Pa.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 4.247.77.43
Remote IP address: 4.247.77.43

No. of Copies read 0
List ABCDE

SandraLyn Bailey

04-20-07

From: Wayne Costin [costin_family@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2006 9:00 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Wayne Costin (costin_family@hotmail.com) writes:

Mr. Martin,

I wanted to take this opportunity to send a quick "thank you" for your continued support of a la carte programming on cable TV.

Since having my first child in 1999, I have talked with friends and colleagues that about how I wished I could buy only the programs that I want in my house. This desire is becoming increasingly important to me now that my oldest is 6 1/2.

My wife and I have shielded our two children from primetime TV over the last 6 years, however, as they are becoming more independent, I worry about what they will see on TV. I fear they will flip on MTV in the middle of the day and see videos they shouldn't be seeing, as an example.

That fear coupled with the rising cost of cable, I wish I could just buy what I need. I saw where the cable companies came out with a "family" package recently. That wasn't a family package, I see a family package with something for everyone in the family, some sports, some home decorating, disney channels, educational channels (like the history channel), etc. I don't expect to get all the sports channels or all the do-it-yourself networks, but a sampling of each would be plenty beneficial.

My wife and I are close to giving up cable all together, yet we enjoy some of the programming. For instance, we sat down as a family last night and watched the history of how Disney World was created with the kids. They loved it!

Anyway, as mentioned above, I just wanted to say that I appreciate your backing on this subject.

Sincerely, a protective parent,

Wayne Costin

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 207.232.169.25
Remote IP address: 207.232.169.25

SandraIyn Bailey

04-207

From: janeinindy@sbcglobal.net
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2006 9:01 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: cable TV

I want you to know that I hope your commission will decide to permit citizens to choose only the programs they want to watch. I hope that my cable bill might be reduced. DISH Satellite has cut off two of my channels and raised my monthly charges.

Thank you.

JaneInIndy@sbcglobal.net
Jane Bonwell
Indianapolis, IN 46208

No. of Copies rec'd 0
LEIABODE

Sandralyn Bailey

04-207

From: MJDRED@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2006 10:56 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Cable TV

2-11-06 AD

Sir:

I heard on the radio yesterday that someone at the FCC is saying that the cable TV customers should be allowed to only pay for what they watch.

Amen and Amen.

I am an older woman and I watch less than half of what I have to pay for. I see so much graphic garbage on cable.

I also think on some channels they put family TV and then put in X rated TV. That way if one choses to delete a channel they know they will be deleting a few good shows.

It's all a game and cable needs more competition so the customer gets more choices. We are all getting raises in our fees, Time Warner goes on record in up state NY today saying they are raising their fees.

Please make a lot of loud noise on the above issues. We should only have to pay what we use.

Mrs. Jo Dermody

mjdred@aol.com

Choctaw, OK 73020

No. of Copies rec'd 0
LHA ABOVE

2/14/2006

Sandralyn Bailey

04-207

From: james D. Metza [jandpmetza@centurytel.net]
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2006 7:34 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

james D. Metza (jandpmetza@centurytel.net) writes:

Honorable Chairman Martin, I want you to know I applaud your efforts in the battle for consumer choice in cable and satellite programming. I recently received an offer from my satellite company with what I call an insult to me as a consumer. With only 35 programming channels of which 9 are shopping channels and two news channels. This is what they call family friendly programming? They cut the programming choices and did not drop the cost in relation. Please force their hand and give us the consumer real choice. Not a penalty for choosing family friendly programming. They are rubbing our nose in it and laughing all the way to the bank.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.179.12.232
Remote IP address: 69.179.12.232

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Sandralyn Bailey

04-207

From: Mel [rubyfor@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2006 4:36 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: cable television

Just want to tell you that many people support your efforts to force cable monopolies to have consumers pay for only the TV channels they want to see. I for one, do not watch most of the channels offered and I resent paying for them. Of course, the cable companies will tell you it is more expensive for consumers to select or "purchase" their own channels. Should this happen, the FCC will need to have an investigation on the abuse of monopolies. Good luck and I hope you succeed. Someone needs to fight for the consumer! Thank you, Mel Rubinstein, FT. Lauderdale, FL.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABOVE

2/14/2006

04207

From: Gerald Stonebraker [badge009@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2006 3:50 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Gerald Stonebraker (badge009@yahoo.com) writes:

Mr.Chairman,

I just read a piece on the issue of "unbundling" cable services and having an a-la-carte option instead. I truly believe this would save consumers a considerable amount of money. However, my concern would be that the cable companies would find a way to increase the channel selection rates which would actually cause an increase to us.I would hope your agency would monitor this very closely to prevent this gauging from occuring.We consumers count on your agency to look out for our best interests. I'm still upset that these cable companies have a virtual monopoly over our cities. I live in a rural village and we can not get another cable company to bid on our services due to prohibitive costs to change lines.

The government thought they did us a favor many years ago to break up Ma Bell into many "Baby" bells.This was in fact a disservice to us as we lost many benefits we had previous, PLUS it's still confusing on who's responsiblity it is to fix a problem (in the residence vs. to the residence lines)

I would appreciate your support for the a-la-carte option, as long as the rates are in line!

Thank you for your time,

Respectfully,

Gerald Stonebraker
102 West Adams Street
Homer, MI 49245
1-517-568-4403 ex.11
badge009@yahoo.com

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 24.56.210.208
Remote IP address: 24.56.210.208

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABOVE

0427

From: Hugh Brian O'Neill [hbon@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2006 10:43 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Hugh Brian O'Neill (hbon@comcast.net) writes:

Kevin,

Thank you for supporting 'a la carte' service. Here's what I think. Every time Comcast has a rate hike the excuse is the cost of paying for new networks or programming increases, such as ESPN. Why should the increase be past on to me when I didn't order the new channel nor do I watch ESPN?

In fact, why should Cable companies have to pay for ad-supported cable channels. Let the cable networks survive on ad sales alone like the traditional networks. I only watch a dozen or so cables networks and that's all I'd rather pay for. I do not want to pay for the dozens of other channels offered that I don't watch, not to mention, I abhor some networks like MTV, Spike TV and BET for their horrible program standards and practices. Let each cable network survive on it's own in a free marketplace. If that's not possible, than open up the markets for more competition against the cable companies. Now, it's cable, satellite or nothing. Don't listen to the cable company lobbyist. Listen to the people. I have a right to pay for what I want and a right to not have to pay for what I don't want in my home. Thank you for your time.

Hugh Brian O'Neill
6407 Waterford Drive
Brentwood, TN 37027

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.53.89.255
Remote IP address: 68.53.89.255

No. of Codes used 0
List ABOVE

04 207

From: Jason Klugh [jasonklugh02@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2006 10:16 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Jason Klugh (jasonklugh02@aol.com) writes:

Kuddos on the reversal of the "a la carte" programming decision. Looking over the AOL poll, over 95% of those polled approve the decision and would take the "a la carte" if offered.

After being in cable for 8 years, this decision will make a huge, positive impact on consumers ability to choice their programming. One caveat however, that I would be happy to share in detail, is how a programmer prices their cost to operators for services. I'm not sure if sanctioning those or limiting what programmers charge for what they call "penetration fees", but it typically increases as subscriber numbers decrease.

Again, very smart decision and I would welcome a conversation to share with you my knowledge.

Best,
Jason Klugh

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 152.163.100.9
Remote IP address: 152.163.100.9

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

04-207

From: kevin williams [indevideo2@juno.com]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2006 12:01 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

kevin williams (indevideo2@juno.com) writes:

alacarte programming for a small cable operator will put us out of business. We do not have the money to upgrade our system to provide alacarte pricing. The last time I checked the government did not own our company and people have a choice in our systems. If they do not want our service they can go to satellite

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.136.26.227
Remote IP address: 64.136.26.227

No. of Copies rec'd 0
USACODE

04-207

From: Kurt Momand [kmomand@Montag.com]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2006 7:51 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Cable Rates

Respectfully you guys must be crazy if you believe that changing the cable pricing to all a carte will on balance save money for the consumer. You will know that it doesn't when the cable companies agree to move in that direction even absent an FCC edict. According to the Atlanta Journal this morning your report found that consumers could save up to 13%. That is if you don't watch over 20 channels. With a family of 5 I can assure we watch over 20 in a month. Once again this an example of a government agency addressing an issue that the consumer is not asking for. If you want to lower pricing increase competition and decrease regulation. New channels and programming would not be able to flourish or grow to sustainability under this format. Move on to more pressing issues.

Kurt T. Momand, CFA
Montag & Caldwell
The Pinnacle
3455 Peachtree Road, N.E.
Suite 1200
Atlanta GA 30326-3248
Tel. 404-836-7219
Fax. 404-836-7154
kmomand@montag.com

Registered Representative with ABN AMRO Distribution Services, Inc.

+++++

Montag & Caldwell's Email Disclosure

This message (including any attachments) is confidential and may be privileged. If you have received it by mistake please notify the sender by return e-mail and delete this message from your system. Any unauthorized use or dissemination of this message in whole or in part is strictly prohibited. Please note that e-mails are susceptible to change. Montag & Caldwell, Inc. shall not be responsible nor liable for the proper and complete transmission of the information contained in this communication nor for any delay in its receipt or damage to your system. Montag & Caldwell, Inc. does not guarantee that the integrity of this communication has been maintained nor that this communication is free of viruses, interceptions or interference.

+++++

No of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

0427

From: Paul MacArthur [PMacArth@Indiana.Edu]
Sent: Saturday, February 04, 2006 12:07 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Paul MacArthur (PMacArth@Indiana.Edu) writes:

Chairman Martin -

In late November, Broadcasting & Cable and Multichannel News reported that FCC's a la carte report under Chairman Powell, "makes mistakes in its basic calculations" and was based on "incorrect and biased analysis."

The Broadcasting & Cable article also states, "A new report to be issued by commission staff soon shows that a la carte 'could be economically feasible and in consumers' best interest."

Has this new report been released to the public?

I have searched the FCC's Web site, but have yet to have any luck locating this new report.

If it has not yet been released, do you know when it will be published?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Paul J. MacArthur
Visiting Lecturer
Department of Telecommunications
Indiana University

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 129.79.91.64
Remote IP address: 129.79.91.64

04/04/2006
LIBRARY

04-207

From: Richard Calvert [rcalvert@midsouth.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2006 8:49 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Richard Calvert (rcalvert@midsouth.rr.com) writes:

PLEASE help s, as consumers, acquire a la carte cable channels. We watch perhaps 8-10 channels (on the outside). All the rest contain content we either block or avoid. We use the V-chip as well. We're paying for extensive channel service that we never use.

We would appreciate the FCC's influence in nudging the cable industry to offer this option.

Thank you!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 66.61.55.152
Remote IP address: 66.61.55.152

0
No. of Copies rec'd
UNCLASSIFIED

09-207

From: Walter A. Neaves [k5kne@swbell.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2006 10:58 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Walter A. Neaves (k5kne@swbell.net) writes:

I urge you to pursue the ala carte channels for satellite and cable viewers. I only watch a few channels and couldn't care less for all the junk channels that I have in the package. Thank You.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.150.167.141
Remote IP address: 69.150.167.141

No. of Changes made 0
LMA AGCDE

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Cfbenade@AOL.com
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2006 5:53 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Need Cable Sold per Channel

Ms. Carol F. Benade
5432 S. Harper Avenue
Chicago, IL 60615

Federal Communication Commission
Washington, DC

Dear Chairman Kevin J. Martin,

I was pleased to read in today's New York Times how much consumers could save on their cable TV bills if they could buy only the channels they wanted instead of being forced to pay for many that they do not want.

I am 71 years old. I have never had cable TV because of the high monthly costs. I see some hope of having cable if I can buy only one or two cable channels.

I wish you success in encouraging cable companies to offer channels piecemeal.

Thank you very much

Sincerely,

Carol F. Benade

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABOVE

2/13/2006

From: budwakeland@comcast.net
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2006 5:22 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: TV charges

Dear Mr. Martin: I was so happy to learn that the FCC may finally force the cable companies do what is only right by the public: Let us pay for what we actually want to watch! I watch very specific stations and programs and have no use for all the other garbage I am forced to buy. Thank you, budwakeland@comcast.net

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

04-207

From: Fred D. Strawser [fredstrawser48@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2006 5:08 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: a la carte cable

Mr. Chairman:

The cable television companies more often than not own and produce the content they then sell to themselves for distribution to consumers over their cable, thus they can largely control their costs.

What I'd like my cable company, Time Warner, to make available:

Two ABC, CBS and NBC affiliates - one local and one not (local programming too often pre-empts national); CNN, all C-Spans, CNBC, Bloomberg, MSNBC, History, Discovery, Travel, TBS, WGN, ONN and most others now received except I do not want and do not need any shopping or religion/religious channels. The local high school produced channel is OK, too.

Oh yea, just for giggles they can throw in Fox News Channel and Fox Network; when Murdock/Ailes launch their Fox News Channel competitor to CNBC I want that, too.

Thank you.

Fred Strawser
Lancaster OH

Fred D. Strawser, registered representative/stockbroker
Wealth accumulation/planning for income in retirement
Stocks, bonds, mutual funds & CDs (FDIC)
1603 E Main, Lancaster OH 43130-3438
740-653-4444

Buy **American!**

No. of Copies Made _____
List ABOVE _____

04-207

From: Ada Brownell [abrownell77@mchsi.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2006 5:47 PM
To: Undisclosed-Recipient;
Subject: a la carte TV

Wonderful! That's all I can say about the possibility of a la carte TV service. Please strongly encourage cable companies to offer a la carte cable and stop letting them force people who hate smut to subsidize it if they have TV. Let those who want porn pay for it.

A la carte is the greatest idea since the first cable service was offered. Great work!

Ada Brownell
Springfield, MO

RECEIVED 0
FEB 13 2006

2/13/2006

04-207

From: Glenn Chesnut [gchesnut@citlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2006 9:41 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: a la carte programming

Thanks for your diligence. We hope that a la carte programming will someday be available from Direct TV, our provider. Any action that achieves this goal would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks,
Glenn Chesnut
Show Low, Arizona

No. of Copies mtd _____ 0
LBI / ELOPE _____

04-207

From: John C Schleiffarth [jcschl@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2006 1:33 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: YES to "a la carte" cable!

Please note my strong support for "a la carte" cable offerings. There are many bundled channels I find useless and some offensive due to smutty content. Thanks!

-John Schleiffarth
1907 Sunny Drive
STL, MO 63122

Number of Copies Sold 0
Date of Sale 01/13/06

2/13/2006

09-207

From: Jonathan Rintels [jonr@creativevoices.us]
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2006 4:41 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: FCC A La Carte Cable Report - Press Release

The following statement was issued by Jonathan Rintels, Executive Director of the Center for Creative Voices in Media, concerning today's FCC revised report on a la carte delivery of cable and satellite programming.

The Center for Creative Voices in Media praises the FCC and Chairman Kevin J. Martin for its revised report on a la carte cable and satellite programming. We are pleased that the FCC recognized the benefits an a la carte cable and satellite video programming delivery option would provide to consumers and independent, diverse, smaller, and niche cable networks.

Today's bundling system gives Big Media -- the broadcast networks and Big Cable -- a chokehold over America's television programming, restricting consumer choice largely to networks owned by broadcast network owners or large cable operators. As the FCC recognizes, an a la carte option would enable consumers to access a wider diversity of programming from additional sources, full of diverse and competing voices and viewpoints -- and at a lower cost. It will also give consumers the ability to choose to not subscribe to networks on cable and satellite that offend them, eliminating any need for extending broadcast indecency regulations to cable. This will be good not only for creative media artists, but for all Americans.

We look forward to working with the FCC, Chairman Martin, and Senator John McCain on these important issues.

The Center for Creative Voices in Media is a nonprofit formed by creative artists to preserve in America's media the original, independent, and diverse creative voices that enrich our nation's culture and safeguard its democracy. Our Board of Advisors includes many prominent Oscar, Emmy, Tony, Peabody, and other award-winning media artists.

If you have any questions or comments on the above, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Jonathan Rintels
Center for Creative Voices in Media
www.creativevoices.us
www.creativevoices.typepad.com (blog)

Center for Creative Voices in Media
1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 100-494
Washington, DC 20005

(202) 448-1517 (voice)
(202) 318-9183 (fax)

jonr@creativevoices.us

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

04-207

From: lthamar Diaz [ball56@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2006 10:03 AM
To: Jonahtan.Adelstein@fcc.gov; KJMWEB; Michael Copps
Subject: Awaiting a reply

Hello Gentlemen,

I wrote to you gentlemen several months ago about your place of work amongst other things. I never received a reply from any of you. I understand being busy and that you probably have a lot of email but what i don't understand is why I haven't even received an email stating that you are working on a reply and will get back to me shortly, or at least on of those automated responses acknowledging that you received my email. Now to add to my previous email... how do you think making cable a la carte is going to lower prices? The only reason stations don't charge cable/satellite providers more to carry their signal is because they know that being a part of a package more people will see their advertising which will increase their worth and they can charge advertising companies more for airtime. If there were no set packages, stations have no assurance that people will want their stations, and therefore advertising firms can will demand cheaper rates on their airtime, which will decrease the stations profits. The station in turn will then charged the cable/satellite providers even more to carry their signal, which of course will be trickled down to the consumer. There is no real study that needs to be made on this subject, bottom line that is how stations get carried, they have good programming that consumers want, so cable companies want the station, the station gets a deal where they get paid a certain amount by the cable company and get to be a part of a popular package, thereby insuring that they will be able to have plenty of possible consumers for advertising firms to try to sell things to. there in is the real mechanism that drives the tv industry. Large consumer pools means more revenue from airtime due to advertising. Tell me what part of my theory you don't agree with.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABOVE

2/13/2006